

REMARKS

The claims are claims 1 to 9.

The application has been amended at many locations to correct minor errors and to refer to the drawing numbers noted by the Examiner. These amendments obviate the objection to the drawings.

Claims 6 and 8 are amended in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 6 is amended to recite "the burst transfer" to make clear that this limitation is to the burst transfer recited in claim 5. Claim 8 is amended to change "aid" to "said."

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Secatch U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0172206 A1.

Claim 1 recites subject matter not anticipated by Secatch. Claim 1 recites "triggering a burst transfer from the change of state of a FIFO output signal, said change of state being the occurrence of a triggering event within the FIFO device." The OFFICE ACTION cites paragraph [0016] of Secatch as anticipating this limitation. This paragraph of Secatch states:

"When the 'FULL' flag is asserted, the 'UNLOAD' signal may be enabled so that, during a read cycle, the data store in the standard FIFO is unloaded."

This test of Secatch makes clear that the change in the FULL flag permits a read cycle "may be enabled." This disclosure of Secatch fails to state that the burst transfer cycle is triggered by the state change but only states that the state change permits a transfer cycle triggered by another event. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Secatch.

Claim 1 recites further subject matter not anticipated by Secatch. Claim 1 recites "inhibiting of triggering of any further

burst transfers until a current burst transfer is complete." The OFFICE ACTION fails to allege that Secatch teaches this subject matter. With no indication of the part of Secatch that anticipates this limitation, claim 1 is allowable over Secatch.

Claim 2 recites subject matter not anticipated by Secatch. Claim 2 recites "said triggering event is change in a FIFO fullness indicator flag." As pointed out above, Secatch teaches that data transfers are permitted following change in the status of the FULL signal but fails to teach that the change of status triggers the data transfer. Thus claim 2 is allowable over Secatch.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as made obvious by the combination of Secatch US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0172206 A1 and Khatib (FIFO, First-In First-Out Memory).

Claim 3 recites subject matter not made obvious by the combination of Secatch and Khatib. Claim 3 recites "said triggering event is changing from said FIFO fullness indicator flag denoting less than half full to greater than half full." Secatch fails to teach a triggering event, only that data transfers are permitted on change of state. The OFFICE ACTION does not allege that Khatib makes obvious this subject matter. Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable over Secatch and Khatib.

Claim 4 recites subject matter not made obvious by the combination of Secatch and Khatib. Claim 4 recites "said triggering event is changing from said FIFO fullness indicator flag denoting greater than half full to less than half full." Secatch fails to teach a triggering event, only that data transfers are permitted on change of state. The OFFICE ACTION does not allege that Khatib makes obvious this subject matter. Accordingly, claim 4 is allowable over Secatch and Khatib.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as made obvious by the combination of Secatch U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0172206 A1 and Uchida et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,545,942 B2.

Claim 9 recites subject matter not made obvious by the combination of Secatch and Uchida et al. Claim 9 recites "inhibiting trigger from processor device, thereby inhibiting further burst transfers until a predetermined number of clock cycles following completion of current burst transfer." The OFFICE ACTION cites claim 17 of Uchida et al as making obvious this limitation. Claim 17 of Uchida et al states:

"17. The semiconductor memory device according to claim 15, wherein the data input section begins to input data when predetermined time has elapsed after burst length being specified by the burst transfer length specifying section."

This portion of Uchida et al specifies a different event starting the period. Claim 9 recites the period begins "following completion of current burst transfer." Claim 17 of Uchida et al states the period begins "after burst length being specified by the burst transfer length specifying section." These two events which begin the period are clearly different. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over the combination of Secatch and Uchida et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that all the present claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Therefore early reconsideration and advance to issue are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed telephone number and address to facilitate prosecution.

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(972) 917-5290
Fax: (972) 917-4418

Respectfully submitted,



Robert D. Marshall, Jr.
Reg. No. 28,527